

NASA REVIEW COMPLETED

8 January 1971

NOTE FOR .

Comments on the Agenda for the 13 January ARGO Meeting

There are a couple of points that I want to pass along in case we do not have the chance to discuss the 13 January agenda in detail.

ERTS A and B, etc.

I guess
I come out saying I agree with your recommendations a, b, c, and d,

but probably not with e. (The latter on the grounds that these questions really should be staffed in other arenas.)

I don't know how to react to this dismal outlook for ERTS A and B. I certainly agree that the government's money will be poorly spent if performance is as poor as suggested. It seems to me, however, that in such a case the role for ARGO should be to (somewhat informally) identify to NASA the fact that imagery of the projected quality will fail to be useful to the various departments and agencies involved. Having done that it then becomes NASA's job either to improve the capabilities, stretch out the program, and/or cancel it. I guess I still don't have a good feel for who is responsible for what in this area. As a minimum, it would seem appropriate for ARGO members to review their ability, if any, to make use of the ERTS A and B product.

With respect to your paragraph 9, I think it probably is well to review the usefulness of ARGO as an interface with the intelligence community. My impression is that it does relatively well with regard to limited ad hoc requests to use intelligence capabilities for some special purpose (e.g., corn blight, gulf coast coverage, etc.) and less well as the medium for coordinating civilian agency activity and interaction in the field of overhead imagery across the board. Most of the most difficult problems really fall in this latter category. Let's try to talk about these before the ARGO meeting.

RSI